

*Professor Raghuveer Singh's Metaphysics :
Is It More Akin to Mahatma Gandhi?*

(Prof. L.S. Rathore)**

Professor Raghuveer Singh is a thinker of great cultivation and erudition, famous and rated high, especially in the field of political theory and the history of political philosophy. Born in a small village in Ghazipur district of Uttar Pradesh in 1929; educated at the U.P. College, Benares, and later at the University of Allahabad; Raghuveer Singh had an unequalled record of success in his student career having consistently a first class to his credit. At Allahabad University he had worked hard, secured his M.A. degree in Politics in 1950, and even at that time he was much of a scholar. Following that he joined as Lecturer in the Department of Political Science of the University of Lucknow; and as a teacher there having studied the political classics, he knew a lot about political theory and philosophy. In 1963, he made his way from Lucknow to Gorakhpur – joined the University of Gorakhpur – where he served as Professor and Head of the Department of Political Science till his retirement in 1989. At Gorakhpur, as years rolled on, he became known, far and wide, as an eminent scholar of political philosophy.

I had an occasion, for the first time, to meet Professor Raghuveer Singh in New Delhi at a three-week Workshop on political theory, the Course Directors of which were Professor Bhaskaran of the University of Madras, and Professor Robert Dahl from the U.S.A. A very scholarly young man of 35 at the time, Raghuveer Singh had

G. Chatterjee
 Y. Mohan Shetye
 X. M. P. Pandit
 Prof. Rajendra Prasad
 Dr. Shah
 Sam Chhokar
 K. D. Tripathi
 Anil Kumar Das
 Rakesh Chandra
 Richa Das
 B. D. Das

cast a spell on each and every participant in the Workshop, by showing his profound thought and insights in political theory. The Course Directors were often very surprised to hear the comments that came from a young scholar, showing great knowledge and understanding of classical philosophy. His inquisitive mind and intellectual curiosity was recognized by the Workshop Directors. Never did I visualize that in the years to follow, Professor Raghuveer Singh would be one of the experts in the Selection Committee for the post of a Professor in Political Science, where I would appear as a candidate! Professor Raghuveer Singh played the tough member in the Selection Committee, and I had to face the toughest test of my life so far. Raghuveer Singh as I have observed, appears tough, but in inmost he is tender-hearted, which few of us have been able to realize, because he does not reveal much of his inner self. All in all, from 1964 till day, I have great admiration of and very enthusiastic about Professor Raghuveer Singh.

Essays on John Locke

Professor Raghuveer Singh's article 'John Locke and the Theory of Natural Law', published in *Political Studies* (Oxford, 1961) is a first-rate, superb contribution to Lockean studies. It is meritoriously near the standard of superlative and eminently good in the domain of philosophy. It has been extensively quoted in books and research journals along with the works of distinguished political thinkers of the world at the time. It is recognized as an unusual, powerful critique of early historians of

political philosophy (Vaughan, Sabine, and Strauss) who found a fundamental contradiction in Locke's so-called empirical theory of knowledge, his nominalism and voluntarism, and his political theory based on the premises of natural law theory harking back to Hooker and the medieval tradition. Professor Raghuveer Singh has proved from the original sources that Locke never took his critique of innate ideas to be an argument against natural law. Beyond compare, this article of Professor Raghuveer Singh, is all wool and a yard wide, and he came to be widely known and honoured for achievement or scholarship. Because of his outstanding analysis and original precision shown, Professor Singh is counted among scholars like Polin, Gibson and others who find a basic unity in Locke's philosophy. This article has remained unsurpassed both in profoundness and insightfulness, and its author appeared on the horizon as a scholar of repute in political philosophy.

In another high-class, masterpiece article on 'John Locke and the Idea of Sovereignty' (Indian Journal of Political Science, 1959), Professor Raghuveer Singh was concerned with an exposition of Locke's theory of sovereignty. He directed the barrel of his gun towards scholars like Vaughan, Barker, and Laski, who had argued that Locke had no theory of sovereignty. Martin Seliger in 'The Liberal Politics of Locke', published in 1968 (London, George Allen and Unwin Ltd.), regards this article of Professor Singh as a distinctive contribution and makes a special reference to it along with the work of Dicey, Lord Bryce, and Gough for a critique of the

distinction between legal and political sovereignty and 'defence of Locke against confusion of issues.'

Both the above essays on Locke are magnificent pieces of philosophical literature, wherein Professor Singh narrates his arguments in a bold and assertive way, duly supported by logic and reason, derived from the original sources or works of Locke.

Philosophia Perennis

Professor Raghuveer Singh's essays on Locke were a prelude to profound thought, produced by him in large amounts, in his essay on ^{Heraklitus} 'Herekleitos and the Law of Nature' (Journal of the History of Ideas, vol. xxiv, no. 4, 1963). The essay is brimful of ideas, indeed, a fantastic achievement. The author's quality of being very accurate and exact in the use of words makes the reading extremely interesting. In a way Professor Singh shows great affection for philosophy and philosophy in turn looks at him fondly. Declaring *philosophia perennis* as one of the central ingredients of Natural Law, Professor Raghuveer Singh explains his own view in the following words:

'A purely humanist, Critical-Marxist or phenomenological 'life world' or 'language game' frame of reference cannot be the proper basis for the reconstruction of human sciences. We must go back to *philosophia perennis*. *Philosophia perennis* believes in the primordial and transcendental unity of Being, relates man to the cosmic order, and sees all his actions as the expression of the eternal and immutable principle of Reason, *lex aeterna*'.

The learned Professor continues:

‘The realm of action, *vita activa*, however, is not an end in itself. It cannot have meaning and purpose, cannot attain its full glory and splendour, unless it is illumined by *vita contemplativa*, unless the human discourse springs from the depth of Divine Logos, unless the love of man is inspired by the love of God, and unless the positive law of the land partakes of the immutable law of nature.’

What is unique in Professor Raghuveer Singh is his phenomenal brain-power – the ability to think and ability to express both are very impressive! Interest in and flair for *philosophia perennis* or *vita contemplativa* are inextinguishable in him. That seems to be his perennial favourite. The manner in which he starts an idea and develops it, clearly reveal that Professor Raghuveer Singh has produced progeny of his own in the study of nature and meaning of the universe and of human life.

Overarching View of Politics

In the years that followed the publication of his essays on Locke and Herakleitos, Professor Singh created quite a flutter among the fraternity of political scientists who had gathered at the 38th All India Political Science Conference held at Patiala in 1978, where in his presidential address titled ‘Causality, Meaning and Purpose in Politics’, he developed and articulated a more philosophical perspective and overarching view of politics, by arguing that the abolition of politics, both as an aspect of human reality and as a subject of study has been the result of scientistic predicament, which is threatening to abolish not only politics but Man himself. This address was later on published in *The Review of Politics*, vol. 47, July 1985, no. 3. In it, Professor Singh is very critical of the definitions of politics as propounded by

David Easton, Harold Lasswell, Quincy Wright, Robert Dahl, etc., because they lack in the basic understanding of politics, which, according to him is the study of good life, or development of ideal relations, or meaningful human existence. He expresses great disappointment that discussions of basic political concepts like freedom, justice, equality and political obligation which constituted the central core of classical political theory do not find a place in the corpus of modern scientific politics. The manner in which the sophistication and continual improvement in the techniques of statistical analysis of observed behaviour and discovery of causal laws and generalizations with explanatory and predictive value have been emphasised is a highly misleading oversimplification. There is hardly anything profound, asserts the author, in David Easton's dogma of 'relevance and action'; it only represents a fashionable way of thinking among some contemporary intellectuals both in America and India. He is led to the conclusion that the effort of thinkers to derive a theory of norms or political action from the empiricist, positive theory of knowledge has failed. So is the fate of value-fact dichotomy doctrine and universal causation theory. Rejecting the idea of scientific theory of politics, because it is logically untenable and philosophically inadequate, Professor Raghuveer Singh says:

'It is logically untenable because the empiricist theory of knowledge and the verifiability theory of meaning on which it is based are riddled with self-contradictions and in any case are totally inapplicable because it distorts the nature of man and destroys his human essence. Man who was created in the image of God becomes a behaving and conditioned animal. Hence arises the paradox of apolitical politics which is in fact the negation of politics resulting from the reduction of action to behaviour, value to fact, reality to process and man

to machine. Its practical consequences are power politics, mass manipulation, indoctrination, large scale social engineering, total regimentation and all that. It signifies the victory of the *homo faber* and *animal laboron* over *homo politicus*'.

Further, Professor Singh states:

'The humanist – Critical-Marxist, existential – framework, though superior to the scientific paradigm, cannot provide a genuine alternative to it. A political order can be conceived only in terms of a transcendent reality. A true theory of politics must be philosophical in the tradition of *Philosophia Perennis*. Its method will be dialectical and dialogical. It will transcend the limits of discursive reasoning and attain the intellectual intuition of the First Principles.'

The conclusions that Professor Raghuveer Singh has thus arrived at are very bright and brilliant, because he recaptures the real grandeur of politics, and quotes with approval Aristotle, who called politics the architectonic science or the master science in the true sense of the term. What an impressive idea, brimful of metaphysics and philosophy – ideal and action both – which Professor Singh has resurrected after the serious study of the discipline and the knowledge and methods involved in it. No one can ignore the fact that in this magnificent address, shining or glowing with light, there is an explosion of scholarly interest of Professor Raghuveer Singh.

Culture of Politics

Professor Raghuveer Singh is a theoretician of genius. He possesses unusually great intelligence, skill and artistic ability to formulate models in political philosophy. His ability to do so is clearly reflected in 'Puntambekar Memorial Lecture', delivered by him at Jodhpur in 1984, to the delegates of Indian Political Science Conference. Expressing his ideas in carefully chosen words, he created a Model of political

culture, which can be appropriately characterised as 'Raghuveerian Model of Indian Political Culture.' He is one of the first in the field, who, working in a thorough, efficient and systematic way, developed a conceptual model of 'Political Culture and Culture of Politics in India.'

Professor Raghuveer Singh states that there is a contrast between traditional Indian and post-Gandhian political cultures in India, though such a contrast cannot be too sharply drawn, because the syndrome is often overlapping. It is a contrast between political culture as such and the culture of pure (power) politics. Yet, he argues, it is one of the striking ironies of our public life that while Gandhism has in no uncertain terms been repudiated both in theory and practice by our political elites, it has always been professed to be the guiding principle of Indian polity. Instead of the elite culture and mass culture – the terms coined by the Western scholars in context to Indian political culture; Professor Raghuveer Singh, in his model, makes a more pertinent distinction between the professed and practiced political cultures, between self-denying ascetic culture and self-indulgent acquisitive culture. He says:

'The former is rooted in the Indian tradition and is articulated in its philosophy, literature, art, myths, symbols and rituals; the latter is the product of western rationalism, secularism, scientism and individualism. The one views politics in terms of eternal verities and transcendent Truth; its political culture is simply an aspect of tradition as a whole, of man's total orientation, intellectual and spiritual, to something beyond politics. The other regards culture as epiphenomena of politics. Cut off from a transcendent source politics itself becomes the source of all values. It comes to acquire a culture, an ethos and style of its own but it ceases to be the real political culture, that is, an integral part of the comprehensive cultural milieu of society as articulated in its art, literature, myths, symbols, historical experience and philosophical worldview.'

Aware of the fact that political culture approach has become an important tool for the understanding of political systems in contemporary political analysis, Professor Raghuveer Singh's contention is that in contemporary Indian society there is a dissonance, a hiatus between political culture as traditionally conceived and the culture of politics as being developed under the aegis of the present-day democratic governments.

Professor Raghuveer Singh highlights that Jawaharlal Nehru had made a radical and far-reaching transformation in the traditional or Gandhian political culture and ideology. Nehru's modern, secular, humanistic, technological *Weltanschauung* and its practical application to politics and society, was an attempt to build socio-political order on anti-traditional concepts, under the garb of synthesis between the Indian tradition and western values, and thus notions contradictory to the spirit of Indian culture began to be promoted in a systematic way. One of the basic values that we started cherishing was that of technological advancement and economic growth without noticing its concomitant evils and paradoxical consequences. And as Nehru believed that ends were more important than means, moral considerations came to occupy a secondary place in the scheme of things, and by and by tended to wither away altogether. As such, when corruption became rampant in our political system, it began to be accepted as inevitable in a developing economy, even regarded as a natural corollary of national progress. The Congress culture which at one time was

the dominant culture in modern Indian politics was the crystallization of this outlook. The other political parties – BJP, BSP, Samajwadi, etc. – have in one form or the other faithfully borrowed the norms of Congress political culture.

What we see today in contemporary India, asserts Professor Singh, is complete break-up from our traditional culture? The culture now-a-days has become entirely acultural and anomic. It has developed a logic of its own, its own ethos and spirit. Instead of culture-oriented politics we have a politics-oriented culture.

In 'Raghuveerian Model' of culture of politics in India, there is a beautiful narration of the rise of a new class of political entrepreneur in independent India, who, in common parlance are called 'Netas'. Who are 'netas'? what is 'neta' culture? 'Netas', writes Professor Singh, 'are not necessarily legislators, party bosses or professional politicians of standing, familiar with national and international issues of current importance. They are self-styled politicians, claiming links with the high ups in the party and working as middle men between the ruling party and the common people. They manage to secure petty material benefits for their clients by inducing the bureaucracy or their junior staff to distribute favours and facilitate the legal process for expeditions disposal of their business. In lieu of this work they take money from their clients and help the officers when they are in trouble by putting in a good word for them to the persons in power.' From our understanding of the culture of politics in India we can say that Professor Raghuveer Singh has given a clear, accurate and

precise meaning of a 'Neta' or 'Netas'; no where to be found in the entire literature of political culture, or theories propounded by the scholars in the field. Equally penetrating is his analysis of 'Neta' culture, which has become so pervasive and persistent that young and incompetent persons are tempted to adopt it not only as an easy means of livelihood but as an effective way of gaining respectability in society. The 'Neta' is a special kind of species. According to Professor Raghuveer Singh: 'He has neither sense of responsibility nor mobility of purpose. Both the ethic of 'absolute end' and ethic of 'responsibility' are beyond his ken. He is guided by pure expediency, exigencies and contrivances. He has neither a respectable means of livelihood nor a fruitful social or personal engagement. Devoid of any professional competence and sense of moral commitment of human destiny, he becomes a real busy-body, organizing a protest march here, a *dharna* or *gherao* there, pressurizing officials for favours to his followers and hangers on and running after high ranking politicians and ministers for political recognition and promotion, a seat in the assembly, or a corporation, or a membership of UIT, etc. He is a social parasite or a man without a vocation. And is it too much to say that neta culture is a veritable *chandal* culture? Are not persons imbued with the spirit of this culture responsible for political murders, defection, bribery, intimidation and violence in social life?' It is because of the proliferation of 'netas' and 'neta' culture, politics in India, is no longer a mission; it has become a business and a lucrative business. There cannot be a better

analysis of the culture of politics in India than what Professor Raghuveer Singh has done. Conjoined with his philosophical outlook, the whole analysis and presentation both are marvellous and wonderful. The essay is a masterpiece of Professor Raghuveer Singh's highly inventive and courageous mind.

Metaphysical Tradition and the Philosophies of Value

Professor Raghuveer Singh's present work, 'Metaphysical Tradition and the Philosophies of Value', is a penetrating analysis of the fallacies of the idea of 'value', and a fuller plea for the recovery and resuscitation of primal Truth, Goodness and Beauty as understood by traditional philosophy or *Philosophia Perennis*. He has gained a proper perspective of the classical philosophies of Truth because of some understanding of the world in which he lives. Imbued as he is with the ideas of Divine Wisdom, Truth, Psyche (Soul), he believes in free and intense political discussion, regarding the place of *Philosophia Perennis* as against the plethora of 'values' that have been developed, overtly and covertly, in the modern period. He argues that there is mass of pseudo-ideas, or amoebic words, without logical grounds and without coherent meanings, that have appeared in the contemporary period in the domain of political theory, even exalted by some, are no more than catchwords to mislead the attention of the public. The ideas of 'development', 'value', 'human right', 'freedom of choice', etc., are precisely such pseudo-ideas, commonly used in political parlance, justifying the exploitation of man and nature in their name. The

gradual encroachment of these pseudo-ideas have not only enhanced the power of vested interests in politics, but have also accelerated the worst kind of exploitation of men in the present-day democratic, mass societies. These pseudo-ideas have been twisted to such an extent as to appear universalistic in nature, and even operate under the 'masks' of traditional philosophy. Fully acquainted with the complex of ideals, beliefs, and standards that characterize or pervades classical philosophy, Professor Raghuveer Singh exposes the self-inconsistencies or semantic emptiness of these pseudo-ideas in a masterly way, through his power of logical scrutiny. For him metaphysical ideas are a totality of infinite time; and the pseudo-ideas that have been created now and then are nothing but the various forms of sentimental substitution for the eternal metaphysical ideas which cannot pass away. Metaphysics is a theory-without-end; it is ageless and everlasting; and Professor Raghuveer Singh, by his high intelligence, has resurrected and elevated it in the contemporary period of technology and science, where man is doubly alienated – from his Divine wisdom and from the world he has created. Interpreting, judging, rating traditional philosophy in its proper place, Professor Raghuveer Singh has been able to dismantle the pseudo-ideas, even blasted them, without showing kindness or mercy. Against the force of his onslaught, the pseudo-ideas dissipate gradually, yields to stress, and eventually buckle under the strain. Professor Raghuveer Singh's central argument in the present work is that the traditional philosophy contain eternal verities and transcendent Truth that cannot be

changed and is so important to the nature and progress of a human being as to be indispensable to him. This concise treatise is the first of its kind in the present-day world, where in addition to exposing the hollowness of the idea of 'value', Professor Singh has successfully conveyed the very essence of *Philosophia Perennis*, where 'witnesses of that great, integral, all-embracing tradition of wisdom fed by the Divine Logos can be found in all ages.'

Drowned in fears, loneliness and sorrows, created by the concepts of human rights and human development which are generally regarded as the most vital values of modern civilization, but, in fact, are absolutely false in logic and extremely hazardous in practice, Man, today, lives under a reign of ceaseless strife, violence and terror. Professor Singh writes:

'In the din and bustle of claims and counter claims the sense of duty and obligation is completely lost. After all, when rights are given axiomatic priority or made the major premise of a social order, everybody would be first concerned with his own rights or claims. How can anybody's claim demand obligation on the part of the other party? The priority of rights then results in a virtual Hobbesian state of nature where there is 'war of all against all', and 'force and fraud' are the cardinal virtues of the state of nature. The contemporary social and political scenario in India and the world in general clearly illustrates this.'

The hidden drifts of the pseudo-ideas of 'value' have driven Man to such a dead end, where his life is without a particular plan or purpose. The essence of happiness does not lie in false ideas of development, but in an act of intellect, in possessing what we love, and in knowing to possess what is eternal. But what is happening today is quite the reverse. The ruling elites shamelessly swear by the name of social justice

without any qualm of conscience. In a beautiful language, which is a peculiar characteristic of Professor Raghuveer Singh, he says:

‘There is no such thing as human development. We must be absolutely clear in our mind, as Mahatma Gandhi certainly was, that greater industrial and technological development can only result in the ever widening chasm between the rich and the poor and the exploitation of the common man, workers in the field and factories by the technocrats and ruling elites, the brokers of power and seekers of fortune... The craze for technology is the disease of modernity. And the triumph of technology is the defeat of Man. We are already at the brink of total ecological disaster and nemesis is going to overtake us soon.’

Professor Raghuveer Singh argues that what is most needed today is goodwill, not technical skill, metaphysical wisdom, not scientific knowledge. The dilemma is that the vital relationship of identity of knowledge and Being or Reality has been ruptured by modern social sciences. As a result, he says, that ‘Man’s outward activities, his powers, talents and his social and political institutions cease to have any integral relationship with his essence, his Real Self, and lose all authenticity, meaning and purpose. The harmony between man and nature is jeopardized and man becomes willfully ambitious, aggressive and possessive. Knowledge is transformed into ideology and various value-systems emerge to fill in the gap caused by the loss of faith in the divinity of man and immortality of soul.’

For the alienated man of the technological age, Professor Raghuveer Singh would like to resurrect self-reflexivity of human consciousness, and quest for the knowledge of himself, and quotes with approval the Socrates’ dictum ‘Know Thyself’, which according to him is the Delphic injunction. The central question that he raises

in the treatise is not 'What is Man?'. but 'Who Am I?' In other words, it is the 'superstition of value' with which he is mainly concerned in this concise treatise.

Professor Raghuveer Singh's conclusion is that the term 'value' is highly malleable and multivocal. It has no definite connotation and is devoid of any objective meaning. He has examined a number of philosophies propounded by social scientists, either for or against values, and himself adheres to traditional philosophy which stands for the knowledge of Suprahuman, Transcendental and Eternal Truth.

The two important trends in Professor Raghuveer Singh's treatise are – his detestation of the pseudo-ideas of 'value' and their dethronement; and his fondness for *Philosophia Perennis* and a resurgence of interest in the works of classical philosophers. He detests pseudo-ideas – the monster – which has always torn the bosom of its mother. Such ideas are like a serpent which chokes philosophy in its embrace. Professor Singh has been able to crush its head without wounding the mother whom it devours. Yet there is the other side of the treatise. Truth, the daughter of metaphysics, voices her joy in Professor Raghuveer Singh's work. The problem for him is to show precisely by what system we can diminish pseudo-ideas of value, and thus alleviate misery and injustice in the world in which we actually live. Professor Singh's answer is metaphysical tradition, in order to make men more enlightened and better. Though he has not built something new, but the manner in which he has revived traditional philosophy is something amazing and novel. The

fountains of his intellect are clearly reflected in this pithy treatise. I am sure that this treatise will give the human mind a great impetus, and will prepare us to think. That is why, Professor Raghuveer Singh, is held in high esteem by me; I admire his scholarship, I love his prose, and I appreciate his taste so sure and so lofty.

Professor Raghuveer Singh has examined the genesis, nature and implications of the modern theories of value and provided a philosophical context for their critical assessment in a brilliant way. He does not in any way mean to denounce human ideals and demigrate human dignity which, properly understood, consists in mirroring God's absolute and creative Goodness. His argument is that the modern writers are not able to appreciate the transcendent and suprahuman element in traditional virtues because they seem to have resolutely set themselves against metaphysics and firmly, almost blindly, believe in the ultimate validity of practical life and the pragmatic point of view. His disquiet about the scientific man is that he makes a fetish of 'facts', as the axiologist hypothesizes 'value'. The modern philosophers of value, instead of providing a viable alternative to the loss of traditional wisdom and the traditional way of life, served only to camouflage and confuse the real issue – the Eternal Truth. Power, knowledge, wealth, honor, and self-respect, says Professor Singh, are all meaningless unless man knows 'Who He Is?' This is knowable through traditional thought where there is no hiatus between Thought and Being, Knowledge and Reality.

He, therefore, categorically declares that analytical clarity and methodological accuracy cannot be a substitute for philosophical profundity and speculative wisdom.

There are some critics of Professor Raghuveer Singh's metaphysics also. The first regards him as a gadfly, a skeptic more interested in attacking the ideas of others than in offering a constructive philosophy of his own. The second says that he is a great lover of metaphysics, but the mistress believes in polyandry and thus is wholly untrustworthy. The third argues that his relentless pursuit of perfection is single-dimensional and has little relevance in solving the problems arising from the technological, global society, where Man has to pass through polymorphous stages. And the last one says that his metaphysics is beyond the grasp of a common man; only professional philosophers can understand him, but they too show signs of faltering. All these criticisms are an inaccurate appraisal of Professor Raghuveer Singh's metaphysics. He is indubitably a writer of great wisdom and depth.

Professor Raghuveer Singh has resurrected the tradition of morality and metaphysics in modern times. That tradition holds that man possesses a Soul, that the soul is nourished by the moral life, and that man's actions ought to accord with the nature of the soul. Man in this life should minister to its needs. He must, if he is to do this, live a moral life, irrespective of what it may cost him in material terms. A moral life, according to him, consists of living according to the dictates of Truth and the grand or meta-narratives of traditional philosophy. The proper care of the Man thus

demands that thought and action be judged according to the standard of *Philosophia Perennis*. From this premise Professor Raghuveer Singh proceeds to the principle which he develops and upon which he insists, that is, the real question is not 'What is Man?' but 'Who am I?', and that alone is the trustworthy mode of knowing Truth, or the essence of Man. It is here that Professor Raghuveer Singh is more akin to Mahatma Gandhi. His faith in metaphysical tradition and its power of infinite perfectibility are more conforming or harmonizing with Mahatma Gandhi. His attack upon impure knowledge or false consciousness; and his advocacy of transcendental philosophy or the innate laws of thought, make him a writer of transcendent genius. Eventually, Professor Raghuveer Singh, like Gandhi, believes in the transcendence of God and the perfection of Man.

To conclude, Professor Raghuveer Singh's treatise is neither ambiguous nor evasive. Being a scholar with convictions, what he thinks, he writes; and what he writes is always precise and meaningful. His arguments in favour of traditional philosophy, and his onslaught against pseudo-ideas of 'value', both are spirited, manifesting a high degree of vitality and sublime thoughts. It seems to me that in the armoury of Professor Raghuveer Singh, there are all sorts of philosophical arrows, capable of destroying impure ideas that have stealthily crept into the domain of contemporary social sciences, and at the same time, to revive and rebuild what seems to have been lost in the glaze of global society. His analysis is neither showy nor

given to or marked by excessive outward display. The strongest point in his writing is that he will never hand over his sword. When he is attacked he fights like a devil, he yields to no one; he is, if I may say so, one scholar who cannot meet his Waterloo. Neither he is used to show or wave the white flag, nor prepared to haul down his colours, because in his fingers, I find that pen runs and laughs, and in his mind the Divine Logos reigns supreme. He chooses words with precision, and expresses thoughts with utmost clarity and accuracy. He is, indeed, one of the finest ornaments in the world today in traditional philosophy. He is a great political thinker, almost a universal genius, spent his life plumbing the mysteries of speculative wisdom. It is not given to every one to make the mind laugh, and what pleasures can surpass those of the mind as witnessed in Professor Raghuveer Singh's present treatise, a cornucopia of grand ideas and a horn of plenty is, in fact, priceless treasure for posterity. The temple of Metaphysics, renovated extensively by Professor Raghuveer Singh, looks majestic and magnificent both. A thinker to the core, Professor Singh's treatise is transcendently impressive and splendiferous in substance – an extremely rare work for which he deserves a big round of applause and hearty congratulations.

****Professor L.S. Rathore is Emeritus Professor in Political Science, and Former Vice Chancellor, J.N. Vyas University, Jodhpur (Rajasthan).**